

**REMARKS**

The Official Action mailed August 16, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully noted. This response is filed within three months of the mailing date of the Official Action and therefore is believed to be timely without extension of time. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that this response is being timely filed.

The Applicant notes with appreciation the consideration of the Information Disclosure Statements filed on September 24, 2003; November 4, 2004; August 12, 2005; November 1, 2005; and June 28, 2006.

A further Information Disclosure Statement was submitted on August 22, 2006 and consideration of this Information Disclosure Statement is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-32 were pending in the present application prior to the above amendment. The Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of the allowability of dependent claims 6-9, and the allowance of claims 17-25 and 27-32 (page 7, Paper No. 20060807). In response and in accordance with the statement of allowed subject matter (Id.), claim 5 has been canceled and each of the allowable dependent claims 6-9 has been rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of base claim 5. Claim 10 has been amended to depend from claim 6. Also, claims 1, 11 and 14 have been amended to better recite the features of the present invention, and new dependent claims 33-35 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. Accordingly, claims 1-35 are now pending in the present application, of which claims 1, 6-9, 11, 14, 17 and 22-25 are independent. For the reasons set forth in detail below, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Paragraph 2 of the Official Action rejects claims 1-5, 11-16 and 26 as anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0210219 to Osame. The Applicant respectfully submits that an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained against the independent claims of the present application, as amended.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, to establish an anticipation rejection, each and every element as set forth in the claim must be described either expressly or inherently in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

With respect to the rejection of claims 1-4 and 26, independent claim 1 has been amended to recite that a first signal (see, e.g., CK in Figure 2A) is inputted to a source of a third transistor (see, e.g., 15b), a second signal (see, e.g., two-state-before signal) is inputted to a source of a fifth transistor (see, e.g., 14a), and the first signal is different from the second signal. Osame does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.

Osame appears to teach that a source of a third transistor 105 and a source of a fifth transistor 106 are connected to each other and the same signal (DATA) is inputted to transistors 105 and 106 (see paragraph [0051] and Figure 1 of Osame). Therefore, Osame does not teach that a first signal is inputted to a source of a third transistor, a second signal is inputted to a source of a fifth transistor, and the first signal is different from the second signal, either explicitly or inherently.

With respect to the rejection of independent claim 5, as noted above, the Applicant has canceled claim 5 and incorporated the features of claim 5 into allowable dependent claims 6-10. As such, amended claims 6-10 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

With respect to the rejection of claims 11-13, independent claim 11 has been amended to recite that a drain of a first transistor (see, e.g. 52 in Figure 4A) is connected to a drain of a second transistor (see, e.g. 51) and a drain of a third transistor (see, e.g. 54); and that sources of the first transistor (see, e.g. 52) and the second transistor (see, e.g. 51) are each connected to a first potential power source (see, e.g. VDD). With respect to the rejection of claims 14-16, independent claim 14 has been amended to recite that a drain of a first transistor (see, e.g. 62 in Figure 5A) is connected to a drain of a second transistor (see, e.g. 61) and a drain of a third transistor

(see, e.g. 64); and that sources of the first transistor (see, e.g. 62) and the second transistor (see, e.g. 61) are each connected to a first potential power source (see, e.g. VSS). That is, a drain of a first transistor is directly connected to a drain of a second transistor and a drain of a third transistor, and sources of the first transistor and the second transistor are each directly connected to a first potential power line. Osame does not teach the above-referenced features of the present invention, either explicitly or inherently.


Osame appears to teach that a drain of a first transistor (see 101 in Figure 4) is connected to a drain of the second transistor (see 201) through a source of the second transistor, which means the drain of the first transistor is not directly connected to a drain of a second transistor. A drain of the first transistor (see 101) is connected to a drain of the third transistor (see 102) through the second transistor (see 201) and a source of the third transistor, which means the drain of the first transistor is not directly connected to a drain of the third transistor. A source of the second transistor (see 201) is connected to the first power source line (see VDD) through the first transistor (see 101), which means that the source of the second transistor is not directly connected to the first power source line. Therefore, Osame does not teach that a drain of a first transistor is connected to a drain of a second transistor and a drain of a third transistor; and that sources of the first transistor and the second transistor are each connected to a first potential power source, either explicitly or inherently.

Since Osame does not teach all the elements of the independent claims, either explicitly or inherently, an anticipation rejection cannot be maintained. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are in order and respectfully requested.

New dependent claims 33-35 have been added to recite additional protection to which the Applicant is entitled. For the reasons stated above and already of record, the Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 33-35 are in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eric J. Robinson  
Reg. No. 38,285

Robinson Intellectual Property Law Office, P.C.  
PMB 955  
21010 Southbank Street  
Potomac Falls, Virginia 20165  
(571) 434-6789